

SUPPLEMENTAL REMARKS

Applicants urge the Examiner to reconsider the remarks in the Request for Reconsideration filed June 7, 2006. Contrary to the interpretation in the Advisory Action, the USPTO-provided English translation of JP 11-64631 to Okumura (“Okumura”) is fully consistent with the partial English translation of Okumura provided by Applicants. Therefore, the USPTO-translation confirms the deficiencies of Okumura.

Specifically, it was explained in the Remarks of the Request for Reconsideration filed June 7, 2006 (see in particular pages 12-13) that Okumura only suggests a polarizing degree of “95% or more” (paragraph [0026] of Okumura), and that, in the “optimal example” (paragraph [0027] of Okumura), there are three polarizing layers and the polarizing degree is around or little more than 95%, so that (i) Okumura does not suggest a polarizing degree of 99% or more over the entire range of 420-700 nm, and (ii) Okumura also does not suggest obtaining this polarizing degree with a combination of two portions as recited in the presently claimed invention.

These explanations were based on a partial English translation of Okumura submitted by the Applicants.

Turning to the USPTO-provided English translation of Okumura, paragraph [0026] indicates a “high polarization degree of 95% or more over the almost whole region of visible light” and paragraph [0027] refers to “the optimal example... utilizes blue and the green and red reflective polarizer of three layers.”

Thus, the USPTO-provided English translation of Okumura is completely consistent with the partial translation by Applicants.

Further, other passages of Okumura confirm the deficiencies of Okumura.

Referring to paragraph [0024] in the USPTO-provided English translation, Okumura achieves the objective of providing polarized light with a high polarization degree over a wide wavelength range by “giving an overlap mutually to the reflected-wavelength range of a reflective polarizer,” i.e., Okumura provides its multiple polarizing films in order to provide sufficient wavelength-range overlap. This overlap is shown, for example, on Fig. 3 of Okumura which shows the “optimal example” of Okumura with three polarizing films. As a result, Okumura does not provide any motivation to reduce the number of polarizing films because this would be expected to consequently reduce the amount of “mutual overlap,” i.e., if polarizing film 102 (curve 302) on Fig. 3 is removed, the overlap of curves 301 and 303 would disappear.

Also, referring to paragraph [0031] in the USPTO-provided English translation, a goal of Okumura is to provide a “vivid color display.” Since paragraph [0027] of Okumura explicitly relates the three layers (“blue and the green and red”) of the “optimal example” to their effect on the color display, there would have been no motivation to remove one of these essential layers, because this would have been expected to be detrimental to the color property of the polarizer of Okumura.

In addition, the USPTO-provided English translation of the full text of Okumura confirms that Okumura is completely silent on how to improve the polarization degree well above 95% over a large wavelength range, which is known to be especially difficult in the case a reflective polarizer.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the USPTO-provided English translation of Okumura confirms that Okumura does not suggest a polarizing degree of 99% or more over the entire range of 420-700 nm, and Okumura also does not suggest obtaining this polarizing degree

with a combination of two portions as recited in the presently claimed invention.

Since Yoshimi fails to teach or suggest a polarizing plate comprising a polarizer with laminated first portion and second portion, as explained in details in the Remarks of the Request for Reconsideration filed June 7, 2006 (see in particular pages 10-11), and the other cited references fail to remedy the deficiencies of Yoshimi and Okumura, the present claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In summary, Applicants urge that laminating a first portion having a high polarization degree at the short wavelength side (420 nm to 550 nm) and a second portion having a high polarization degree at the long wavelength side (550 nm to 700 nm), as recited in present claims 1 and 13-15, is not taught or suggested in the cited prior art, but these features of the presently claimed invention are the result of the Applicants' endeavors to solve a problem of the prior art in which a high polarization degree could not be obtained at either the long or the short wavelength side. Thus, the present inventors have obtained a polarizing plate having a high polarization degree at both the long and the short wavelength side with a simple, efficient, and cost-effective optical construction.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 020582

Customer No.: 38834

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

NES:rep